

7/10/70

Mr. Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Atty. Gen.
U. S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20530

Dear Mr. Kleindienst,

In writing you June 10, I suggested I could explain something in
FBI Exhibit 60 that might be troublesome in the future and might be susceptible
of innocent explanation. Thank to the two prints enclosed with your letter
of July 6, I believe I can now do this with fair certainty.

Any examination of FBI Exhibit 60, with even the limited magnification
provided by the photographic enlargements, disclosed that the upper left-hand insert
of the enlarging hole in the back of the shirt does not coincide with the
enlarged hole in the shirt itself. One of the most obvious discrepancies is that
in the enlargement the damage not near the left-hand edge of the vertical
stripe of the shirt appears, whereas in the unenlarged view of the entire back
it does. This was an unexpected and unreported by the members of the
technical experts, the FBI, which made the exhibit, should give you an idea
of the nature of the investigation and the care with which evidence was prepared
and examined.

By comparing the enlargement you were kind enough to send me with
the unenlarged shirt picture, I am now nearly confident that the insert was
pinned upside down, that is it is reversed to before seen to be identical.
Furthermore, the photo you sent me above shows more than the insert in the Exhibit
60. If you have a duplicate print of that you send me, you will see it is
still labelled upside down. The legend should partly obliterate the word
and that is the bottom of the picture.

The questions I still have about this evidence are the following:
However, I am entitled to say it is a manufactured, if improbable, alibi-
proposal. I now ask you a rhetorical question, one to which it would be useless
to ask to answer this subject, for you are now in your present position as the
sign of this exhibit, but that might not even the import of this interagency
agreement by the defense, in open court, before a jury, at least one explanation
I offer you being, I expect no answer of you, but since does this little taking
tell you of the character and responsibility of this evidence and its importance?

Let me again preface response to the remainder of your letter as to
the explanation I have you have no personal knowledge of this or what you
wrote, that you have to get your information from others. Without any such
information from you, I believe, you accurately reflect what you have been told.
As I tried to inform the Attorney General as well as the Vice Chief, on this
subject his process of information (informational) and I doubtfully the same
as his prosecutorial side. In preparing you to respond to my questions about the
spectrographical analysis they referred you to the less definitive of the only

undefinitive statements that are available in the extra Commission evidence. Then Mr. Franklin testified that the science of spectrography cannot be more than that "the various items were found to be similar in metallic composition" he was saying exactly what I told you, only that they were all of lead, not a bit more. Spectrography is a very precise science. It gives the finest reading of compositions, including of the added elements. If it shows only similarity it shows the samples are not of common origin. His testimony would cover most of the bullets ever made, various plumbing materials, type-lead and a wide assortment of other objects.

If you wish my word on this, may not get someone to copy you with a definition or description of the science, from almost any standard source, and not through your usual channels, for by now you should be in a position to under see well you are being informed.

That paragraph dealing with the documents relating to the extra David Sarnoff is a rather tricky formulation. Because I intend to carry this forward, as you should know, I cannot respond with the forthrightness and completeness of my earlier correspondence offered. However, I will tell you it is not consistent with the reality, of which I have repeatedly written, and you should look forward to finding in your copy that you do not describe, what your Department does have - not what I tell you, for I do have it. These things do not meet the professed or my own standards for withholding. But in the matter simply one of the Commission doing what your last statement says and that, too, has not been done. You might want to consider that we obtained for the Commission and then withheld from it, by your Department. Believe me, I do have the proof. Or am I referring to a single item only. However, I am trying to help you to help yourself, for as I have repeatedly tried to do is the government work, my purpose is the pursuit of fact and truth, not scandal. If you doubt me on this, I will prove it to you in the cases involving the possibility of my withholding under either the law or the guidelines, if in my proving both the withholding and the character I attribute to it you will provide me with replies. Again, I am trying to be open with you, so I tell you that when I can I will be filling B-116 forms in both cases. These two instances are not of immediate priority with me, but they surely will illustrate my point, without jeopardizing the interests I plan.

I do accept your suggestion in your final paragraph and, as far as your Department is concerned, will let talk matter rest there. However, I tell you especially that if your penultimate paragraph, dealing with the "minerals", is correct, that is even worse than if it is not. I do believe you are telling me here exactly what you were told. I suggest you have been subsequently informed and that you will not be adequately informed because those in your Department who should know the truth dare not tell you. I hesitate to carry this further at this point however, because I do not desire that you personally be hurt by the fact that you occupy the position you do. I will assure you that nothing has gone not account for the lead in the President's hands. If you will be bold enough or reputable, as, I repeat, you will be in the form to which the government forces me.

You can send me as you will Mr. Tolson and I trust that I offered to try and be helpful in speaking to him. If this letter does not convince you I am a fool, should I not suggest my motives might be that I represent this to you?

Yours truly,